Advanced Knowledge Based Systems
CS3411

Foundations of Propositional Logic

Enrico Franconi

9.00	MT3111 M110	MT3241 M213	MT3031 M212	MT3031 M212	MT3031 M212
10.00	CS3451 1.5 MT3061 M214 waXMT3121M213	CS3421 LF14 BM3031 waXMT3111M110 wbXMT3241M213	CS3251 1.5 MT3241 M213	CS3321 1.5 MT3061 M214	CS3321 1.5 MT3211 M213
11.00	CS3251 1.5 MT3121 M218	CS3151 1.5 BM3031 MT3111 M110	CS3001 1.5 CS3121 1.3 MT3341 M213	CS3311 1.5 MT3121 M218	CS3411 LF14 EM2491 RosA waXMT3171M213 wbXMT3211M213
12.00	CS3071 1.1 wbXMT3061M214	MT3361 M213	CS3451 1.5 MT3171 M217	MT3211 M213	CS3411 LF14 EM2491 RosA MT3361 M213
1.00		CS3071 1.1	CS39x0 1.1 CS39x0 1.5	CS3131 1.3 CS3341 LF15	
2.00	CS3001 1.5 CS3121 1.3 wbXMT3061M214 MT3341 M213	CS3411 LF14 XEM2491 BM3010 B3 MT3101 M213 MT4321 MOH		CS3101 1.1 MT3101 M213 MT4321 MOH	CS3311 1.5 MT3171 M216
3.00	CS3131 1.3 CS3341 LF15 MT3071 M110	XEM2491 SBM3010 FSAB SBM3010 M107 SBM3010 S450 waXMT3101M213 XMT4321 MOH		CS3421 LF14 SBM3020	CS3041 1.5 BM3020 FeSm
4.00	CS3101 1.1 MT3071 M110	CS3041 1.5 SBM3010 FSAB SBM3010 M107 SBM3010 S450 waXMT3341M213 wbXMT3361MG08		CS3151 1.5 SBM3020	BM3020 FeSm

References

- Book: Russell and Norvig *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*
  Read first part of Chapter 6 for this lecture's material
- "Logic", Schaum's Outlines by J. Nolt, D. Rohatyn, and A. Varzi, McGraw-Hill, 1998
- "Mathematical Logic", by H.D. Ebbinghaus, J. Flum, and W. Thomas, Springer-Verlag, 1984
- "A Mathematical Introduction to Logic", By Herbert Enderton, Academic Press, 1972

Knowledge bases

Inference engine	⟵	domain-independent algorithms
Knowledge base	⟵	domain-specific content

- Knowledge base = set of *sentences* in a *formal* language = logical *theory*
- *Declarative* approach to building an agent (or other system):
  TELL it what it needs to know
- Then it can ASK itself what to do—answers should follow from the KB
- Agents can be viewed at the *knowledge level*
  i.e., what they know, regardless of how implemented
- Or at the *implementation level*
  i.e., data structures in KB and algorithms that manipulate them

Logic in general

- *Logics* are formal languages for representing information such that conclusions can be drawn
- *Syntax* defines the sentences in the language
- *Semantics* define the "meaning" of sentences; i.e., define *truth* of a sentence in a world
- E.g., the language of arithmetic

  $x + 2 \geq y$ is a sentence; $x2 + y >$ is not a sentence

  $x + 2 \geq y$ is true iff the number $x + 2$ is no less than the number y

  $x + 2 \geq y$ is true in a world where $x = 7,\ y = 1$

  $x + 2 \geq y$ is false in a world where $x = 0,\ y = 6$

  $x + 2 \geq x + 1$ is true in every world

The *one and only* Logic?

- Logics of different order
- Modal logics
  - epistemic
  - temporal and spatial
  - …
- Description logic
- Non-monotonic logic
- Intuitionistic logic
- Deontic logic
- …

But: There are “standard approaches”

$\leadsto$ propositional and predicate logic

Types of logic

- Logics are characterized by what they commit to as “primitives”
- Ontological commitment: what exists—facts? objects? time? beliefs?
- Epistemological commitment: what states of knowledge?

Language	Ontological Commitment (What exists in the world)	Epistemological Commitment (What an agent believes about facts)
Propositional logic	facts	true/false/unknown
First-order logic	facts, objects, relations	true/false/unknown
Temporal logic	facts, objects, relations, times	true/false/unknown
Probability theory	facts	degree of belief 0…1
Fuzzy logic	degree of truth	degree of belief 0…1

Entailment – Logical Implication

$$\boxed{KB \models \alpha}$$

- Knowledge base KB *entails* sentence α
  if and only if
  α is true in all worlds where KB is true
- E.g., the KB containing "the Manchester United won" and "the Manchester City won"
  entails "Either the Manchester United won or the Manchester City won"

Models

- Logicians typically think in terms of *models*, which are formally structured worlds with respect to which truth can be evaluated
- We say m is a *model* of a sentence α if α is true in m
- $M(\alpha)$ is the set of all models of α
- Then $KB \models \alpha$ if and only if $M(KB) \subseteq M(\alpha)$
- E.g. KB = United won and City won

  α = City won

  or

  α = Manchester won

  or

  α = either City or Manchester won

Inference – Deduction – Reasoning

$$\boxed{KB \vdash_i \alpha}$$

- $KB \vdash_i \alpha$ = sentence α can be derived from KB by procedure i
- *Soundness*: i is sound if

  whenever $KB \vdash_i \alpha$, it is also true that $KB \models \alpha$
- *Completeness*: i is complete if

  whenever $KB \models \alpha$, it is also true that $KB \vdash_i \alpha$
- Preview:
  - we will define a logic (first-order logic) which is expressive enough to say almost anything of interest, and for which there exists a sound and complete inference procedure.
  - That is, the procedure will answer any question whose answer follows from what is known by the KB.

Propositional Logics: Basic Ideas

Statements:

The elementary building blocks of propositional logic are *atomic statements* that cannot be decomposed any further: *propositions*. E.g.,

- “The block is red”
- “The proof of the pudding is in the eating”
- “It is raining”

and logical connectives “and”, “or”, “not”, by which we can build **propositional formulas**.

We are interested in the questions:

- when is a statement **logically implied** by a set of statements, in symbols: $\Theta \models \phi$
- can we define **deduction** in such a way that deduction and entailment coincide?

Syntax of Propositional Logic

Countable alphabet Σ of **atomic propositions**: $a, b, c, \ldots$.

Propositional formulas: $\phi, \psi \longrightarrow a$ *atomic formula*

ϕ, ψ	$\longrightarrow$	a	*atomic formula*
	$\mid$	$\bot$	*false*
	$\mid$	$\top$	*true*
	$\mid$	$\neg\phi$	*negation*
	$\mid$	$\phi \wedge \psi$	*conjunction*
	$\mid$	$\phi \vee \psi$	*disjunction*
	$\mid$	$\phi \rightarrow \psi$	*implication*
	$\mid$	$\phi \leftrightarrow \psi$	*equivalence*

- Precedence of operators: $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow = \leftrightarrow$.

- **Atom:** atomic formula
- **Literal:** (negated) atomic formula
- **Clause:** disjunction of literals

Semantics: Intuition

- Atomic statements can be *true* `T` or *false* `F`.
- The truth value of formulas is determined by the truth values of the atoms (*truth value assignment* or *interpretation*).

Example: $(a \vee b) \wedge c$

- If a and b are wrong and c is true, then the formula is not true.
- Then *logical entailment* could be defined as follows:
- ϕ is implied by Θ, if ϕ is true in all "states of the world", in which Θ is true.

Semantics: Formally

A **truth value assignment** of the atoms in Σ or **interpretation** over Σ is a function $\mathcal{I}$:

$$\mathcal{I}\colon \Sigma \to \{\mathtt{T}, \mathtt{F}\}.$$

Instead of $\mathcal{I}(a)$ we also write $a^{\mathcal{I}}$.

A formula ϕ is *satisfied* by an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ ($\mathcal{I} \models \phi$) or is *true* under $\mathcal{I}$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathcal{I} \models \top & & \\
\mathcal{I} \not\models \bot & & \\
\mathcal{I} \models a & \text{iff} & a^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathtt{T} \\
\mathcal{I} \models \neg\phi & \text{iff} & \mathcal{I} \not\models \phi \\
\mathcal{I} \models \phi \wedge \psi & \text{iff} & \mathcal{I} \models \phi \text{ and } \mathcal{I} \models \psi \\
\mathcal{I} \models \phi \vee \psi & \text{iff} & \mathcal{I} \models \phi \text{ or } \mathcal{I} \models \psi \\
\mathcal{I} \models \phi \rightarrow \psi & \text{iff} & \text{if } \mathcal{I} \models \phi, \text{ then } \mathcal{I} \models \psi \\
\mathcal{I} \models \phi \leftrightarrow \psi & \text{iff} & \mathcal{I} \models \phi, \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{I} \models \psi
\end{array}$$

Example

$$\mathcal{I}\colon \begin{cases} a & \mapsto & \mathtt{T} \\ b & \mapsto & \mathtt{F} \\ c & \mapsto & \mathtt{F} \\ d & \mapsto & \mathtt{T} \\ & \vdots & \end{cases}$$

$$((a \vee b) \leftrightarrow (c \vee d)) \wedge (\neg(a \wedge b) \vee (c \wedge \neg d)).$$

Exercise

- Find an interpretation and a formula such that the formula is true in that interpretation (or: the interpretation satisfies the formula).
- Find an interpretation and a formula such that the formula is not true in that interpretation (or: the interpretation does not satisfy the formula).
- Find a formula which can't be true in any interpretation (or: no interpretation can satisfy the formula).

Satisfiability and Validity

An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is a **model** of ϕ:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \phi$$

A formula ϕ is

- **satisfiable**, if there is some $\mathcal{I}$ that satisfies ϕ,
- **unsatisfiable**, if ϕ is not satisfiable,
- **falsifiable**, if there is some $\mathcal{I}$ that does not satisfy ϕ,
- **valid** (i.e., a **tautology**), if every $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of ϕ.

Two formulas are **logically equivalent** ($\phi \equiv \psi$), if for all $\mathcal{I}$:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \phi \text{ iff } \mathcal{I} \models \psi$$

Exercise

Satisfiable, tautology?

$$(((a \wedge b) \leftrightarrow a) \rightarrow b)$$

$$((\neg\phi \rightarrow \neg\psi) \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \phi))$$

$$(a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee b \vee \neg d)$$

Equivalent?

$$(\phi \vee (\psi \wedge \chi)) \quad \equiv \quad ((\phi \vee \psi) \wedge (\psi \wedge \chi))$$

$$\neg(\phi \vee \psi) \quad \equiv \quad \neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi$$

Try to use **truth tables** to support your conclusions.

Consequences

Proposition:

- ϕ is a tautology iff $\neg\phi$ is unsatisfiable
- ϕ is unsatisfiable iff $\neg\phi$ is a tautology.

Proposition: $\phi \equiv \psi$ iff $\phi \leftrightarrow \psi$ is a tautology.

Theorem: If ϕ and ψ are equivalent, and χ' results from replacing ϕ in χ by ψ, then χ and χ' are equivalent.

Entailment

Extension of the entailment relationship to sets of formulas Θ:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \Theta \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \models \phi \text{ for all } \phi \in \Theta$$

Remember: we want the formula ϕ to be implied by a set Θ, if ϕ is true in all models of Θ (symbolically, $\Theta \models \phi$):

$$\Theta \models \phi \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{I} \models \phi \text{ for all models } \mathcal{I} \text{ of } \Theta$$

A first form of Propositional inference: Enumeration method

Let $\alpha = A \vee B$ and $KB = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$

Is it the case that $KB \models \alpha$?

Check all possible models—α must be true wherever KB is true

A	B	C	$A \vee C$	$B \vee \neg C$	KB	α
$False$	$False$	$False$				
$False$	$False$	$True$				
$False$	$True$	$False$				
$False$	$True$	$True$				
$True$	$False$	$False$				
$True$	$False$	$True$				
$True$	$True$	$False$				
$True$	$True$	$True$				

A first form of Propositional inference: Enumeration method

Let $\alpha = A \vee B$ and $KB = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$

Is it the case that $KB \models \alpha$?

Check all possible models—α must be true wherever KB is true

A	B	C	$A \vee C$	$B \vee \neg C$	KB	α
$False$	$False$	$False$	$False$			
$False$	$False$	$True$	$True$			
$False$	$True$	$False$	$False$			
$False$	$True$	$True$	$True$			
$True$	$False$	$False$	$True$			
$True$	$False$	$True$	$True$			
$True$	$True$	$False$	$True$			
$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$			

A first form of Propositional inference: Enumeration method

Let $\alpha = A \vee B$ and $KB = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$

Is it the case that $KB \models \alpha$?

Check all possible models—α must be true wherever KB is true

A	B	C	$A \vee C$	$B \vee \neg C$	KB	α
$False$	$False$	$False$	$False$	$True$		
$False$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$False$		
$False$	$True$	$False$	$False$	$True$		
$False$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$		
$True$	$False$	$False$	$True$	$True$		
$True$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$False$		
$True$	$True$	$False$	$True$	$True$		
$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$		

A first form of Propositional inference: Enumeration method

Let $\alpha = A \vee B$ and $KB = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$

Is it the case that $KB \models \alpha$?

Check all possible models—α must be true wherever KB is true

A	B	C	$A \vee C$	$B \vee \neg C$	KB	α
$False$	$False$	$False$	$False$	$True$	$False$	
$False$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$False$	$False$	
$False$	$True$	$False$	$False$	$True$	$False$	
$False$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	
$True$	$False$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$True$	
$True$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$False$	$False$	
$True$	$True$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$True$	
$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	

A first form of Propositional inference: Enumeration method

Let $\alpha = A \vee B$ and $KB = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$

Is it the case that $KB \models \alpha$?

Check all possible models—α must be true wherever KB is true

A	B	C	$A \vee C$	$B \vee \neg C$	KB	α
$False$	$False$	$False$	$False$	$True$	$False$	$False$
$False$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$False$	$False$	$False$
$False$	$True$	$False$	$False$	$True$	$False$	$True$
$False$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$
$True$	$False$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$
$True$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$False$	$False$	$True$
$True$	$True$	$False$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$
$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$	$True$

Properties of Entailment

- $\Theta \cup \{\phi\} \models \psi$ iff $\Theta \models \phi \rightarrow \psi$
  (Deduction Theorem)
- $\Theta \cup \{\phi\} \models \neg\psi$ iff $\Theta \cup \{\psi\} \models \neg\phi$
  (Contraposition Theorem)
- $\Theta \cup \{\phi\}$ is unsatisfiable iff $\Theta \models \neg\phi$
  (Contradiction Theorem)

Equivalences (I)

Commutativity	$\phi \vee \psi$	$\equiv$	$\psi \vee \phi$
	$\phi \wedge \psi$	$\equiv$	$\psi \wedge \phi$
	$\phi \leftrightarrow \psi$	$\equiv$	$\psi \leftrightarrow \phi$
Associativity	$(\phi \vee \psi) \vee \chi$	$\equiv$	$\phi \vee (\psi \vee \chi)$
	$(\phi \wedge \psi) \wedge \chi$	$\equiv$	$\phi \wedge (\psi \wedge \chi)$
Idempotence	$\phi \vee \phi$	$\equiv$	ϕ
	$\phi \wedge \phi$	$\equiv$	ϕ
Absorption	$\phi \vee (\phi \wedge \psi)$	$\equiv$	ϕ
	$\phi \wedge (\phi \vee \psi)$	$\equiv$	ϕ
Distributivity	$\phi \wedge (\psi \vee \chi)$	$\equiv$	$(\phi \wedge \psi) \vee (\phi \wedge \chi)$
	$\phi \vee (\psi \wedge \chi)$	$\equiv$	$(\phi \vee \psi) \wedge (\phi \vee \chi)$

Equivalences (II)

Tautology	$\phi \vee \top$	$\equiv$	$\top$
Unsatisfiability	$\phi \wedge \bot$	$\equiv$	$\bot$
Negation	$\phi \vee \neg\phi$	$\equiv$	$\top$
	$\phi \wedge \neg\phi$	$\equiv$	$\bot$
Neutrality	$\phi \wedge \top$	$\equiv$	ϕ
	$\phi \vee \bot$	$\equiv$	ϕ
Double Negation	$\neg\neg\phi$	$\equiv$	ϕ
De Morgan	$\neg(\phi \vee \psi)$	$\equiv$	$\neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi$
	$\neg(\phi \wedge \psi)$	$\equiv$	$\neg\phi \vee \neg\psi$
Implication	$\phi \rightarrow \psi$	$\equiv$	$\neg\phi \vee \psi$

Normal Forms

Other approaches to inference use syntactic operations on sentences, often expressed in standardized forms

Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

conjunction of $\underbrace{\textit{disjunctions}\text{ of }\textit{literals}}_{\textit{clauses}}$: $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n}(\bigvee_{j=1}^{m} l_{i,j})$

E.g., $(A \lor \neg B) \land (B \lor \neg C \lor \neg D)$

Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)

disjunction of $\underbrace{\textit{conjunctions}\text{ of }\textit{literals}}_{\textit{terms}}$: $\bigvee_{i=1}^{n}(\bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} l_{i,j})$

E.g., $(A \land B) \lor (A \land \neg C) \lor (A \land \neg D) \lor (\neg B \land \neg C) \lor (\neg B \land \neg D)$

Horn Form (restricted)

conjunction of *Horn clauses* (clauses with ≤ 1 positive literal)

E.g., $(A \lor \neg B) \land (B \lor \neg C \lor \neg D)$

Often written as set of implications:

$B \Rightarrow A$ and $(C \land D) \Rightarrow B$

Theorem For every formula, there exists an equivalent formula in CNF and one in DNF.

Why Normal Forms?

- We can transform propositional formulas, in particular, we can construct their CNF and DNF.
- DNF tells us something as to whether a formula is satisfiable. If all disjuncts contain $\perp$ or complementary literals, then no model exists. Otherwise, the formula is satisfiable.
- CNF tells us something as to whether a formula is a tautology. If all clauses (= conjuncts) contain $\top$ or complementary literals, then the formula is a tautology. Otherwise, the formula is falsifiable.

But:

- the transformation into DNF or CNF is expensive (it costs exponential space)
- it is only possible for finite sets of formulas

Summary: important notions

- Syntax: formula, atomic formula, literal, clause
- Semantics: truth value, assignment, interpretation
- Formula satisfied by an interpretation
- Logical implication, entailment
- Satisfiability, validity, tautology, logical equivalence
- Deduction theorem, Contraposition Theorem
- Conjunctive normal form, Disjunctive Normal form, Horn form